

REMARKS

Applicants have added claims 52-66 and amended claims 21, 23, 40-48, and 50. Claims 1-20 and 22 have been cancelled. Claims 24, 49, and 51 were previously presented. Claims 25-39 are withdrawn. Claims 21, 23-24, and 40-66 are presented for examination. No new matter has been added. Favorable reconsideration and further examination are respectfully requested.

Election/Restrictions

Applicants acknowledge the election of the invention of Species I, drawn to the embodiment of Figs. 1-5E, and submit that claims 21-24 and 40-66 read on the elected species. The election is made without traverse.

Claim Objections

Claim 22 was objected to because, according to the Examiner, a space is needed between “radio” and “frequency” on lines 3 and 5 of the claim. Claim 22 has been canceled, and as such, the objection is now moot with respect to claim 22.

Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. §112

Claim 43 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being incomplete for omitting essential structural cooperative relationships of elements. According to the Examiner, “there is no indication of where the other end of the parallel branch is to be connected in the claim.” Applicants have amended claim 43 to recite “a parallel branch having a first end connected to the output of at least one of the first and second signal paths, and a second end connected to ground.” Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of this rejection in view of the amendments to claim 43.

Claim 47 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. Specifically, according to the examiner, “[i]t is unclear which output circuitry the applicant is referring to since the claim would have output circuitry in both the parallel branch

and the shared output signal.” Applicants have amended claim 47, and respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of this rejection in view of such amendments.

Allowable Subject Matter

Applicants acknowledge Examiner’s conclusion that claims 23, 24, 45, 46, and 48-51 would be allowable if rewritten in independent form. Applicants have amended claims 23, 45, 46, 48, and 50 placing each in independent form including all the limitations of their respective base claim and any intervening claims. Each of claims 21, 24, 40-42, 44, 47, 49, and 51-66 depend from one of claims 23, 45, 46, 48, and 50 and are allowable for at least the same reasons.

Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. §102/103

Claims 20, 22, and 42 were rejected over U.S. Patent No. 6,014,551 (Pesola); claims 21, 40 and 44 were rejected over Pesola in view of U.S. Patent Pub. 2002/0049075 (Takagi).

As mentioned above, claim 23, which was identified by the Examiner as containing allowable subject matter, was rewritten in independent form to include all of the limitation of the base claim 20 and any intervening claims (i.e., claim 22). Each of claims 42, 21, 40 and 44 depend from claim 23 and are allowable for at least the same reasons. Claims 20 and 22 have been canceled, and as such, the rejection of claims 20 and 22 is now moot.

Each of the dependent claims is believed to define patentable features of the invention. Each dependent claim partakes of the novelty of its corresponding independent claim, in light of the foregoing amendments, and, as such, has not been discussed specifically herein.

It is believed that all of the pending claims have been addressed. However, the absence of a reply to a specific rejection, issue or comment does not signify agreement with or concession of that rejection, issue or comment. In addition, because the arguments made above may not be exhaustive, there may be reasons for patentability of any or all pending claims (or other claims) that have not been expressed. Finally, nothing in this paper should be construed as an intent to concede any issue with regard to any claim, except as specifically stated in this

Applicant : Block, et al.
Serial No. : 10/552,926
Filed : March 27, 2006
Page : 21 of 21

Attorney's Docket No.: 14219-101US1 / P2003,0217
USN

paper, and the amendment of any claim does not necessarily signify concession of unpatentability of the claim prior to its amendment.

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, Applicant respectfully submits that the application is in condition for allowance, and such action is respectfully requested at the Examiner's earliest convenience.

Please charge any additional fees, not already covered by check, or credit any overpayment, to deposit account 06 1050, referencing Attorney Docket No. 14219-101US1.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: October 18, 2007



Paul A. Pysher
Reg. No. 40,780

Fish & Richardson P.C.
225 Franklin Street
Boston, MA 02110
Telephone: (617) 542-5070
Facsimile: (617) 542-8906